



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

explanation of eleven and twelve, without resorting to a doubtful phonological law or assuming a primitive meaning that lacks the essential element of fitness. Whether Lithuanian *dvy-lika*, etc., contain a derivative of the root *liq*, and whether it is possible or probable that the phrase "remainder of one" would be used in primitive times to express the idea of eleven, are questions still left open, though such questions can be answered affirmatively with less confidence if the analogy of the Teutonic forms cannot be cited.

F. A. BLACKBURN.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, Jan. 26, 1897.

ON THE HILDEBRANDSLIED.

IN his review of Gallée, 'Altsächsische Sprachdenkmäler,' *Englische Studien*, XXII, p. 262 ff., F. Kluge takes occasion to express his opinion on the dialect of the Hildebrandslied. He considers the manuscript text as fundamentally High German. The *t* which stands for HG. *t* as well as for HG. *z(z)*, — then mostly double (*tt*), — he supposes to represent two different sounds, both HG. In the latter case, namely, it should stand for Germanic *t*, which had already been shifted towards the HG. *z(z)*, but had not yet reached this final phase. Thus, the OS. element would be reduced to a minimum, and Gallée was right in excluding the poem from his OS. documents.

Kluge's explanation of this *t* is untenable. It presupposes a condition of affairs much more archaic than the manuscript in other respects reveals, and very archaic indeed it would have to be, a *t* standing both for HG. *z* and *ʒ*, and consequently antedating the HG. split of Germanic *t*. The text has *d* for West Germanic *b* next to exclusively, it has consistently *t* for West Germanic *þ*, it has *uo* for Germanic *ō*; a practically unshifted Germanic *t* is not compatible with such features.

If, however, Kluge takes the *t* to represent a somewhat later phase, more nearly like the normal HG. *z* and *ʒ*, we

would have the same sign *t* standing for three very different sounds: (1) for the common HG. *t*; (2) for HG. **tþ*, the forerunner of *z*; and (3) for **þ*, the sound which must have preceded the HG. *z*.

With a rendering of sounds so imperfect as this, no safe conclusions of any sort could be drawn from the manuscript spelling; the *k* may then as well stand for *h(h)*, the *p* for *pf* or *ff*, etc.; and, indeed, unless we interpret quite a number of other details in a similar way, the OS. element would still remain far from being reduced to a minimum, even so far as phonology is concerned. Cp. on this point especially F. A. Wood, *The Dialect of the Hildebrandslied*, in the Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XI, p. 323 ff., though some of the author's arguments are fanciful.¹ And altogether, the view first held by Müllenhof, that the original text was OS., has been well established by Kögel in *Paul's Grundriss*, II, p. 174 ff. An additional indication that the first scribe was a High German may perhaps be found in the form of the phrases *Heribrantes sunu*, line 7, and *quad Hiltibraht*, line 30, and *quad Hiltibrant*, lines 49 and 58 (Braune's text), which are commonly and rightly considered as interpolations. In them the scribe himself speaks to us on his own account; he naturally uses his own language here if anywhere. The *d* of *quad* and the *t* of the names rather betray the High German, while the *h* of *Hiltibraht*, of course, shows that the interpolation is due to the first scribe. In the poem itself he succeeded to a certain extent in rendering the OS. sounds. The constant use of *t* for OS. *d* appears pardonable enough when we consider that the majority of our Ohg. manuscripts, phonetically exact as they on the whole are, neglect to a large extent the difference between voiced and voiceless sounds; the *s* stands throughout, in old as in modern times, for both varieties, and the hesitancy as between *g* and *k*, *b* and *p* also indicates a certain obtuseness in this respect. It is, therefore, much more natural to understand the *t* of our scribe from this point of view, as a HG. substitution for *d*,

¹ I refer to what Wood says on page 325 of *sceotantero*, on page 326 of the *d* in *wāri*, *sūdsat*, on page 328 of the *h*, on pages 327 and 329 of the *ou* in *bougā*.

than it would be to take with Kluge the *tt* in *whîtte*, etc., for any sort of a HG. sound.

With regard to line 48,

dat dû noh bî desemo rîche reccheo ni wurti,

F. A. Wood supposes, *l.c.*, p. 325, that 'the line has been changed here, perhaps unintentionally, in the attempt to replace one alliteration that had been lost by one that the writer could appreciate. Originally, the line might have read in some such way as Möller (*Ahd. All.* 64) suggests':

ðat ðu wreccheo ni wurti bi ðesse waltantes rîche.

But for an unintentional deviation this change seems altogether too radical; and as Wood himself, in agreement with Kögel, has shown, the first scribe much more attempted to give the poem in its OS. form, while the later copyists simply transcribed the text in a mechanical way. The simplest emendation that suggests itself is:

ðat ðu noh bi ðesemu weroldrîke wrekkio ni wurti.

The verse is less objectionable metrically, and the common but meaningless prefix *worolt* (cp. *irmindeot*, l. 13, *irmingot*, l. 30), either the first or the second scribe could easily omit by mere oversight.

Wettu, in line 30, — the quantity of the *e* is disputed, — seems most probably to stand for *wêstu* 'thou knowest'; it is then an interesting mistake of the HG. scribe who, knowing that an OS. *t* commonly corresponded to his native sibilant, carried his principle too far in this word in which, for once, the OS. itself had a sibilant also. This interpretation makes it impossible to see, with *Luft*, 'Die Entwicklung des Dialogs im alten Hildebrandsliede,' a present tense in the following *gileitôs*, while the *du* of the dependent clause may refer to *irmingot* or to *Hadubrand*. I take it to address the latter, and the change from the *ðu* of *wêstu*, abrupt as it may seem at first sight, is yet no more so than that which commonly occurs in the usual formula *weiz got, er* —.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.